

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/825,920	04/03/2001	Ronald G. Udell	40524-SGTI	3656	
25763	7590 04/07/2004		EXAMINER		
	& WHITNEY LLP TUAL PROPERTY DEPA	WINSTON, RANDALL O			
	SIXTH STREET	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
MINNEAPO	DLIS, MN 55402-1498		1654		

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

\$ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \		Applicat	ion No.	Applicant(s)	
		09/825,9	9 20	UDELL ET AL.	
Office Action Summa		Examine		Art Unit	
`.		Randall	Winston	1654	
The MAI	LING DATE of this commun	ication appears on th	e cover sheet with th	ne correspondence add	ress
A SHORTENEI THE MAILING - Extensions of time after SIX (6) MON - If the period for rep - If NO period for rep - Failure to reply with Any reply received	D STATUTORY PERIOD F DATE OF THIS COMMUN may be available under the provisions THS from the mailing date of this comm bly specified above is less than thirty (3 bly is specified above, the maximum st nin the set or extended period for reply by the Office later than three months a adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no ending the state of	event, however, may a reply be atutory minimum of thirty (30) will expire SIX (6) MONTHS for polication to become ABANDO	e timely filed days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this con DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.
Status					
1)⊠ Respons	ive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>12 Jan</u> uary 20	<u>04</u> .		
		2b)☐ This action is			
3) Since this	s application is in condition	for allowance excep	ot for formal matters,	prosecution as to the	merits is
closed in	accordance with the practi	ice under <i>Ex parte</i> C	uayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Cla	ims				
4a) Of the 5) ☐ Claim(s) 6) ☑ Claim(s) 7) ☐ Claim(s)	1-18 is/are pending in the astabove claim(s) 1-3 and 18 is/are allowed. 4-17 is/are rejected. is/are objected to. are subject to restrict	g is/are withdrawn fro			
Application Paper	'S				
10) The draw Applicant Replacem	fication is objected to by the ing(s) filed on is/are may not request that any objectent drawing sheet(s) including or declaration is objected to	: a) ☐ accepted or bection to the drawing(s) g the correction is requ	be held in abeyance. ired if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFF	
Priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119				
a)	dgment is made of a claim Some * c) None of: ertified copies of the priority ertified copies of the priority pies of the certified copies plication from the Internation tached detailed Office action	documents have be documents have be of the priority documental Bureau (PCT Ru	en received. en received in Applic nents have been rece ule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National S	stage
Attachment(s)					,
1) Notice of Referen	nces Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summ	nary (PTO-413)	
2) Notice of Draftsp	erson's Patent Drawing Review (Fosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or	•	Paper No(s)/Ma	- 1	152)

Art Unit: 1654

DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgement is made of receipt and entry of the amendment filed on January 12, 2004.

Claims 4-17 are under examination.

The rejection made under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, has been overcome by Applicant's amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 4-6, 12 and 15-16 as amended stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Matsuyama in view of Hoffman.

Applicant argues Matsuyama and Hoffman, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, provide any motivation or an expectation of success to one having ordinary skill in the art that a unitary "soft gel capsule" containing corosolic acid could be prepared. Applicant's argument is not found persuasive because Hoffman's beneficial teaching is not limited to a gelatin capsule that is only of a two-piece hard gelatin capsule. Hoffman's gelatin capsule teaching encompasses either a soft gel capsule or a two-piece hard gelatin capsule. Therefore, as the examiner explained in his non-final office action, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the claimed invention by modifying Matsuyama 's

Art Unit: 1654

powdered herbal extract containing corosolic acid according to Hoffman's beneficial teachings that the easiest way to take dry powdered herbs internally is to use soft gel capsules. The combined teachings would have resulted in the claimed soft gel composition comprising corosolic acid to be administered for the maintenance of blood sugar levels and weight-loss. Furthermore, the adjustment of other conventional working conditions (e.g., the amount of corosolic acid contained within a soft gel capsule), is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Accordingly, the invention as a whole is prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

Claims 4-17 as amended stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuyama in view of Hoffman, McPeak, LaGrone, Matsutani et al. and Shanmuyasundam et al.

Applicant argues that the combination of these references above would not create a soft gel capsule comprising corosolic acid, rice bran oil, silica, yellow's bee's wax and an extract of *Gymnema sylvestre* in various amounts. Applicant's argument is not found persuasive because as the examiner explained in his non-final office action, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to create the claimed invention by modifying Matsuyama 's oral powdered composition teachings to include Hoffman's beneficial oral soft gel teachings (note: the

Art Unit: 1654

yellow bees wax taught by Matsutani is being utilized to coat the soft gel capsule) and also to include the beneficial teaching taught by McPeak (please note that McPeak also teaches that rice bran derivates can also be in a liquid form), LaGrone, and Shanmyasundam because each of the active ingredients taught by McPeak, LaGrone, and Shannmyasundam's are each being utilized for the maintenance of blood sugar levels in order to obtain an improved claimed invention soft gel composition to be administered for the maintenance of blood sugar levels and weight-loss. Furthermore, the result-effective adjustment of conventional working conditions therein (e.g., the amount of each active ingredient contained within a soft gel capsule), is deemed merely a matter of judicious selection and routine optimization which is well within the purview of the skilled artisan.

Accordingly, the invention as a whole is prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, especially in the absence of evidence to the contrary.

No claims are allowed.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

Art Unit: 1654

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Randall Winston whose telephone number is 571-272-0972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-5PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brenda Brumback can be reached on 571-272-0961. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BRENDA BRUMBACK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Page 5

Art Unit: 1654

Page 6